REMARKS

Claims 1-21 have been cancelled. Claims 22, 29, and 36 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 22-42 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The results of the collection processing operation are a **tangible** outcome of performing the collection processing operation on the collection and are **provided** to the request originator (returned). It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection of all claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sundarajan (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,577). Sundararajan describes transmitting a job that is "typically binary data which describes a task to be performed. In the preferred embodiment, a job is a binary large object (BLOB) that is tagged with a job type identification so that the NRS computer knows the type of job being submitted. The job type identification can be referenced in a field of a database to provide the SC computer with information on steps to be executed to complete the job." (Sundararajan, 3:51-62). Sundarararajan does not describe (1) that a "collection includes collection specifier information and collection content information," (2) that a "request includes a symbolic task name and a collection reference expression," or (3) that "the collection reference expression includes a sequence of characters that refers to the collection," as recited in Claim 22. Claim 22 is therefore believed to be allowable.

Claims 23-28 depend from Claim 22 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

Claim 29 similarly recites (1) that a "collection includes collection specifier information and collection content information," (2) that a "request includes a symbolic task name and a collection reference expression," and (3) that "the collection reference expression includes a sequence of characters that refers to the collection," and is believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

Claims 30-35 depend from Claim 29 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

Claim 36 similarly recites (1) that a "collection includes collection specifier information and collection content information," (2) that a "request includes a symbolic task name and a collection reference expression," and (3) that "the collection reference expression includes a sequence of characters that refers to the collection," and is believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

Claims 37-42 depend from Claim 36 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/8/2007

Robyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V   408-973-2596
F   408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014